

## **Remarks**

### **1. Introductory remarks**

Applicants thank the Examiner for issuing the supplemental notice of allowability including comments regarding acceptance of all original drawings filed for this application, and for issuing an annotated version of an information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on April 21, 2008 for this application, but which was not previously annotated by the Patent Office.

### **2. Amendments to the drawings**

Applicants submit a replacement drawing sheet and an annotated drawing sheet for Figure 6. Reference character 602 was removed from Figure 6, because that reference character is not recited in the specification. Furthermore, the Descriptions associated with the parameters named “g\_ad\_pools” and “g\_programstart” have been revised to include text associated with those parameters. Support for amending those Descriptions is shown in Figure 6 of U.S. Patent Application No. 60/240,714, which is incorporated by reference into the specification.

Applicants also submit herewith a replacement drawing sheet for Figure 10. The hand-drawn reference characters and text shown on the original Figure 10 is computer-generated on the replacement drawing sheet for Figure 10. The lead lines for the reference characters have been redrawn on Figure 10 so as to connect those lines to the item referenced by each respective reference character.

### **3. Interview summary**

On August 16, 2011, David Ciesielski, registration number 57432, called Examiner Sigmond to carry out a telephonic examiner interview. During the interview, David Ciesielski asked for confirmation whether all of the original drawings had been accepted for this application. Furthermore, David Ciesielski advised Examiner Sigmond that Applicants filed two

IDS on April 21, 2008, but that one of those IDS, in particular, the IDS citing to patent documents by Merriman et al., Armstrong et al., Eldering, Charles A., and Wong et al., was not annotated by the Patent Office. Examiner Sigmond stated it was his intent to accept all of the drawings and that he would investigate how the record could be updated with regard to whether the patent documents cited on the non-annotated IDS were considered by the Patent Office.

#### **4. Concluding remarks**

Applicants respectfully request that the amendments to the drawings be entered and that the issued patent include Figures 6 and 10 shown on the replacement drawing sheets instead of the originally filed Figures 6 and 10.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN  
HULBERT & BERGHOF LLP**

Date: September 23, 2011

By: /David L. Ciesielski/  
David L. Ciesielski  
Reg. No. 57,432